

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

TONYA DODSON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:22-cv-12395

Hon. Brandy R. McMillion

v.

Mag. David R. Grand

DEPARTMENT OF VETERAN  
AFFAIRS,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER ADOPTING RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION OF REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION (ECF NO. 35) AND GRANTING DEFENDANT’S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF NO. 25)**

Plaintiff Tonya Dodson (“Dodson”) brings this *pro se* employment discrimination action against her former employer, Defendant Department of Veteran Affairs (“the VA”). Dodson alleges that she was subject to a hostile work environment on the basis of her sex, race, age, and in retaliation for protected activity in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. ECF No. 1.

On December 8, 2022, the Honorable Mark A. Goldsmith referred all pretrial matters in this case to Magistrate David R. Grand. ECF No. 8. On January 12, 2024, the VA moved for summary judgment on the basis that Dodson sued the wrong defendant, she failed to establish a hostile work environment, and she failed to timely exhaust all administrative remedies. ECF No. 25.

On April 2, 2024, this case was reassigned from Judge Goldsmith to the undersigned. The Court then re-referred all pretrial matters to the Magistrate Judge, including the motions for summary judgment. ECF No. 30. On July 15, 2024, in a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), the Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court grant the VA’s motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 35. At the end of the R&R, the Magistrate Judge advised the parties that to seek review of her recommendation, they had to file specific objections with the Court within 14 days of service of the R&R. *Id.* at PageID.833.

As of the date of this order, August 6, 2024—22 days since the Magistrate Judge filed the R&R—neither party has filed objections to the R&R or contacted the Court to ask for more time to file objections. The failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also Ivey v. Wilson*, 832 F.2d 950, 957-58 (6th Cir. 1987) (explaining that a party’s failure to timely object to a report and recommendation allows a court to accept the recommendation “without expressing any views on the merits of the magistrate’s conclusions”). Similarly, failure to object to an R&R forfeits any further right to appeal. *See Berkshire v. Dahl*, 928 F.3d 520, 530 (6th Cir. 2019) (recognizing that a party forfeits their right to appeal by failing to timely file objections to an R&R).

Accordingly, because neither party objected to the R&R, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgement (ECF No. 35) is **ADOPTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 25) is **GRANTED**.

**THIS IS A FINAL ORDER THAT CLOSES THE CASE.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: August 6, 2024

s/Brandy R. McMillion  
Hon. Brandy R. McMillion  
United States District Judge